

## REMARKS

[002] Applicant respectfully requests continued examination, reconsideration, and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims **16, 18-21, and 30-34** will be pending following entry of the amendment submitted herein
- **No claims are** canceled herein
- **No claims are** withdrawn herein
- Claims 16 and 30 are amended herein
- Claims 32-34 are added herein

[003] Furthermore, new **claims 32-34 are** fully supported by the Application, and therefore **do not** constitute new matter. Support for **these new claims** is found in the specification at least at **page 13, lines 13-24.**

### Claim 30 Complies With § 112 2nd Paragraph

[004] Claim **30** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant notes that “a network” was recited in claim 30 at the last line of page 3 of the previous response. This recital provides antecedent basis for the recital of “the network” to which the Office objects. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

## Cited Documents

[005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Deshpande*: *Deshpande et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108768
- *Pham*: *Pham et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,143,288
- *Durden*: *Durden et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,380,258
- *Gold*: *Gold et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059735
- *Cezeaux*: *Cezeaux*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199184

## Claims 16, 18-21, and 30-34 Are Non-Obvious Over the Proposed Combinations

[006] Claims 16, 18-21, and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over various combinations of the cited documents. More specifically, claims 16 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Deshpande in view of Pham and Durden, and further in view of Gold. Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Deshpande in view of Pham and Durden, and further in view of Gold and Cezeaux. Finally, claims 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Deshpande in view of Pham and Gold. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 16

[007] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 16 is moot. Specifically, the proposed combination of **Deshpande, Pham, Durden, and Gold** does not teach or suggest the claimed, "identifying the requested configuration information associated with the client device based on the received identifier, wherein the requested configuration information differs from configuration information associated with the other client devices in the household."

[008] Claim 16 recites in part, "identifying the requested configuration information associated with the client device based on the received identifier, wherein the requested configuration information differs from configuration information associated with the other client devices in the household." The Office cites **Deshpande, paragraph 0042** as teaching communicating the requested configuration information to the client device from the first configuration server. (Office Action, page 3.)

[009] Deshpande describes that, the client (e.g., Aquos TV) seamlessly uses the application that resides on the remote networked computer device (server). Thus, since the use of the application by the Deshpande clients is seamless, the Deshpande clients use the same application as it resides on the server. As a result, the Deshpande application is the same for all of the Deshpande clients. Deshpande, therefore, fails to disclose identifying the requested configuration information associated with the client device based on the received identifier, wherein the requested configuration information differs from configuration information associated with the other client devices in the household as recited by claim 16.

**[0010]** Moreover, Gold merely discloses an application and a duplicate application. (Gold, paragraph 0015). Thus, the Gold applications are duplicates and do not differ from one another. Accordingly, Gold also fails to disclose the subject recital of claim 16. Furthermore, neither, Pham, Durden, nor Cezeaux are cited for or disclose the subject recital of claim 16.

**[0011]** Consequently, the proposed combination of **Deshpande, Pham, Durden, and Gold** does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

**Dependent Claims 18-21 and 30-34**

**[0012]** Applicant respectfully submits that for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 15, independent claim 30 and new independent claim 32 are allowable over the various proposed combinations. Moreover, claims **18-21 and 31, and 33-34** ultimately depend from independent claims **16, 30, and 32**. As discussed above, claim **16, 30, and 32** are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims **18-21 and 31, and new claims 33-34** are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from allowable base claims. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

**[0013]** Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/ Dated: October 7, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005)  
Registration No. 53725

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826